

How are government cuts affecting diversity?

The latest 2024-25 [Employment Equity report](#) provides the first indications of the effects of government cuts on hiring, promotion, and separation rates of visible minority and Indigenous groups. Unions and diversity advocates have expressed concern that cuts will fall [disproportionally on minority groups](#) and called for mandatory equity impact assessments.

In contrast to previous years, the size of the public service has remained stable at close to 267,000, but overall hiring has decreased by 32 percent and promotions by 18 percent. Total representation of visible minority and Indigenous groups has remained largely unchanged compared to the previous year but has dramatically increased since 2016-17. The percentage of women has also remained largely the same at 56.8 percent in 2024-25, up by about two percent compared to 2016-17.

This analysis aims to provide an initial assessment of the impact of public service reductions on employment equity and whether detailed hiring, separations and promotions data substantiate the concerns expressed by unions and advocates.

Based on the 2021 census data, the workforce availability (WFA) for all women is 55.3 percent (executives 42.2 percent), visible minorities 22.7 percent (executives 15.8 percent), and Indigenous peoples 4.1 percent (executives 3.9 percent). Representation of all groups exceeds the workforce availability, suggesting conscious efforts to improve representation. However, given the explosive growth in immigration post-2016, the current MFA is out of date, and the 2026 census-based WFA may provide a different result.

Visible minorities

Regarding visible minorities, Figure 1 examines the overall representation of visible minorities, comparing the total visible minority population with the [Employment Equity report](#) numbers for 2024-25 and 2016-17. It also measures the degree of under- and over-representation of various groups for all-employee and EX levels compared to the 2021 census data, and thus understates the degree of under-representation given the large increase in visible minorities over the past five years. The 2025 gaps are most significant for South Asian, Chinese, and Filipino groups. Blacks are slightly overrepresented along with Southeast Asians, other, and multiple visible minorities. Representation has improved slightly for most groups compared to last year and significantly compared to 2016-17.

Figure 1: Visible Minority Representation

	2025	2024	2017	Gap Pop	Census 2021	Growth 2025-17	Change 2025-24	2025
Black	5.1%	5.0%	2.8%	0.8%	4.3%	163.3%	3.5%	13,741
South Asian	4.4%	4.3%	2.7%	-2.7%	7.1%	138.7%	4.2%	11,811
Chinese	3.2%	3.3%	2.9%	-1.5%	4.7%	57.8%	-3.9%	8,464
Arab/West Asian	2.9%	2.8%	1.6%	-0.0%	2.9%	158.2%	4.8%	7,706
Southeast Asian	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%	219.0%	28.1%	3,892
Latin American	1.2%	1.1%	0.6%	-0.4%	1.6%	190.0%	5.7%	3,115
Filipino	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	-1.7%	2.6%	135.7%	-0.8%	2,421
Korean	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	-0.3%	0.6%	155.3%	-1.4%	873
Japanese	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	-0.2%	0.3%	27.8%	-3.9%	299
Other	2.7%	2.3%	1.9%	2.2%	0.5%	102.7%	17.0%	7,080
Multiple	1.6%	1.7%	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%	102.6%	-6.3%	4,363
All VisMin	23.9%	22.9%	15.1%	-2.6%	26.5%	127.3%	4.5%	63,765
Indigenous	5.5%	5.3%	5.2%	0.5%	5.0%	51.5%	4.1%	14,737
NVMIP	70.6%	71.8%	79.6%	2.1%	68.5%	27.6%	-1.5%	188,433

Highlighting: Population gap: Red, under represented. 2025-17. Green, greater than 150 percent. 2025-24. Green, greater than 5 percent, Red, decrease

In terms of executives, all groups remain underrepresented save for other and multiple visible minorities. Once again, underrepresentation is greatest for South Asian, Chinese, and Filipino executives. Underrepresentation is least for Arab/West Asian and Southeast Asian. Similarly, representation has improved significantly for all groups compared to 2016-17, most notably for Southeast Asians and Blacks, but representation of South Asians, Arab/West Asians, and Korean executives has declined since last year.

Figure 2: Visible Minority Representation Executives

	2025	2024	2017	Gap Pop	Census 2021	Growth 2025-17	Change 2025-24	2025
Black	3.2%	3.0%	1.4%	-1.1%	4.3%	249.3%	9.4%	255
South Asian	3.2%	3.2%	2.6%	-3.9%	7.1%	82.6%	0.8%	252
Chinese	1.9%	1.7%	1.5%	-2.8%	4.7%	86.3%	14.6%	149
Arab/West Asian	2.8%	2.7%	1.5%	-0.1%	2.9%	176.3%	4.2%	221
Southeast Asian	1.0%	0.8%	0.3%	-0.1%	1.1%	413.3%	22.2%	77
Latin American	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	-1.1%	1.6%	180.0%	0.0%	42
Filipino	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	-2.3%	2.6%	185.7%	11.1%	20
Korean	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	-0.4%	0.6%	60.0%	-5.9%	16
Japanese	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	-0.2%	0.3%	11.1%	0.0%	10
Other	1.9%	1.7%	1.1%	1.4%	0.5%	146.7%	9.6%	148
Multiple	2.3%	2.1%	1.0%	1.4%	0.9%	223.2%	11.0%	181
All VisMin	17.3%	16.4%	10.2%	-9.2%	26.5%	152.5%	7.7%	1,371
Indigenous	5.6%	5.5%	3.9%	0.6%	5.0%	116.0%	4.0%	445
NVMIP	77.1%	78.1%	86.0%	8.6%	68.5%	33.1%	0.8%	6,110

Highlighting: Population gap: Red, under represented. 2025-17. Green, greater than 150 percent. 2025-24. Green, greater than 10 percent, Red, decrease of 5 percent or more

Figure 3 illustrates hiring rates, which represent the percentage of public servants hired in each group compared to the total number of hirings, using the 2024-25 data and the percentage change over the past year and from 2016-17. The overall 32 percent drop in hirings has affected most groups, but overall, hiring rates of visible minorities increased slightly compared to the previous year, with considerable variation by group and gender. Only Chinese, Korean, and Japanese women and Southeast Asian men’s hirings increased compared to 2023-24. Compared to 2016-17, all groups save Chinese had increases of 100 percent or more except for Chinese men and women.

Figure 3: Visible Minority Hiring Rates

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black	6.8%	6.1%	7.1%	6.8%	2.8%	2.9%	-5.0%	-9.8%	139.9%	112.0%
South Asian	6.7%	5.3%	6.6%	5.2%	2.6%	2.3%	1.7%	2.7%	159.6%	126.5%
Arab/West Asian	3.8%	3.3%	4.1%	3.4%	1.6%	1.4%	-7.6%	-1.0%	134.8%	140.5%
Chinese	2.6%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	1.8%	2.2%	-1.4%	10.6%	43.8%	23.4%
Latin American	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%	-5.4%	5.0%	101.5%	95.4%
Southeast Asian	1.5%	1.4%	1.2%	1.4%	0.5%	0.6%	20.2%	0.6%	178.6%	118.5%
Filipino	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.6%	-1.0%	-6.3%	158.5%	114.2%
Korean	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%			-29.0%	62.2%		
Japanese	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%			-5.4%	30.9%		
Mixed Origin	1.5%	1.6%	1.8%	2.4%	1.0%	1.1%	-17.1%	-34.5%	47.5%	45.4%
Other	2.3%	3.1%	1.2%	1.8%	5.9%	6.1%	90.3%	68.0%	-60.7%	-49.5%
All VisMin	27.9%	26.6%	27.6%	26.3%	17.5%	18.1%	0.9%	1.2%	59.1%	46.9%
All Indigenous hires	3.9%	4.9%	3.5%	4.8%	3.3%	5.2%	9.8%	1.7%	17.3%	-6.1%
All non NVMIP hires	68.3%	68.5%	68.8%	68.9%	79.2%	76.7%	-0.9%	-0.6%	-13.8%	-10.7%
All employees	7.3%	7.4%	10.0%	11.6%	8.0%	9.2%	-27.2%	-35.6%	-8.9%	-18.9%

Note: Given small numbers, gender breakdowns for Korean and Japanese not available for 2016-17.
 Highlighting: 2024-23, Green, increase of 10 percent or more, Red, decrease of 5 percent or more.
 2024-17 Green increase of 100 percent or more, Red, decrease

Figure 4 captures the flip side of hiring, which is separations, including retirement, leaving the public service for the private sector, or other reasons. Overall, separation rates are lower for visible minorities when compared to non-visible minorities and non-Indigenous public servants. Although not explicitly controlled in this data, age and length of employment are likely factors, given the younger demographics of most visible minority public servants. While separation rates for some groups of visible minority women have increased significantly over the past year, for most women visible minorities, separation rates are much lower compared to 2016-17.

Figure 4: Visible Minority Separation Rates

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black	4.8%	4.2%	4.5%	4.2%	5.1%	8.3%	7.4%	-0.1%	-4.6%	-49.1%
South Asian	3.8%	3.8%	3.9%	4.0%	3.3%	3.6%	-3.2%	-6.3%	14.0%	4.2%
Arab/West Asian	4.6%	4.3%	4.3%	3.2%	3.6%	3.5%	7.1%	34.4%	27.8%	22.8%
Chinese	3.4%	3.6%	3.8%	3.6%	3.0%	3.4%	-10.5%	2.2%	14.4%	7.6%
Latin American	3.6%	3.6%	3.1%	3.0%	2.2%	4.5%	18.1%	19.3%	63.2%	-19.3%
Southeast Asian	3.0%	3.4%	3.9%	3.1%	3.1%	3.9%	-21.5%	9.2%	-0.5%	-13.4%
Filipino	2.8%	3.9%	2.9%	3.4%	3.8%	4.9%	-1.5%	13.6%	-25.0%	-21.6%
Korean			2.8%	4.9%						
Japanese			5.0%	4.2%						
Mixed Origin	4.5%	4.8%	4.4%	3.9%	4.5%	4.5%	1.6%	23.4%	0.4%	5.5%
Other	4.2%	4.2%	4.4%	4.4%	10.4%	13.4%	-3.6%	-3.8%	-59.5%	-68.3%
All VisMin Sep.	4.1%	4.0%	4.1%	3.8%	4.5%	5.9%	0.5%	4.7%	-10.1%	-32.5%
All Indigenous Sep.	5.4%	6.6%	6.1%	6.6%	6.2%	6.2%	-10.8%	0.7%	-13.0%	7.9%
All NVMIP Sep.	6.2%	6.5%	6.2%	6.3%	6.5%	7.5%	0.9%	3.0%	-4.2%	-13.8%
All employees Sep.	5.7%	5.9%	5.7%	5.7%	6.2%	7.2%	-0.2%	2.7%	-8.3%	-18.1%

Note: Given small numbers, gender breakdowns for Korean and Japanese not available for 2016-17.
Highlighting: Green, increase of 10 percent or more, Red, decrease of 10 percent or more.

Figure 5 examines the promotion rates by group and gender. The overall decrease in promotions in 2024-25 can be seen in virtually all visible minority groups, particularly for women. Compared to 2016-17, promotion rates were significantly higher for Black and Southeast Asian women and Latin American men, with 2024-25 lower promotion rates resulting in overall declines for other groups, partially reversing previous progress.

Figure 5: Visible Minority Promotion Rates

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Black	9.8%	11.4%	12.2%	14.4%	8.8%	9.2%	-19.9%	-20.6%	10.6%	25.0%
South Asian	7.6%	9.9%	11.0%	13.4%	8.1%	10.3%	-30.6%	-26.3%	-6.1%	-3.8%
Arab/West Asian	11.2%	12.4%	13.0%	16.7%	12.1%	13.6%	-14.1%	-25.9%	-7.6%	-8.8%
Chinese	8.2%	9.2%	10.4%	13.4%	8.0%	10.0%	-21.0%	-31.0%	2.3%	-7.6%
Latin American	11.8%	12.0%	11.6%	15.9%	10.4%	11.9%	1.3%	-24.6%	12.5%	0.7%
Southeast Asian	9.4%	10.3%	11.5%	15.5%	6.8%	8.7%	-17.9%	-33.3%	37.8%	18.0%
Filipino	8.0%	9.0%	10.6%	11.8%	9.1%	9.7%	-24.6%	-23.6%	-12.2%	-6.5%
Korean	9.9%	12.0%	13.0%	16.9%			-23.8%	-28.7%		
Japanese	8.9%	7.5%	7.5%	12.0%			19.0%	-37.8%		
Mixed Origin	10.3%	11.5%	12.3%	15.3%	9.6%	12.4%	-16.8%	-25.2%	6.7%	-7.2%
Other	8.2%	11.2%	12.2%	14.7%	11.1%	11.1%	-32.7%	-23.5%	-26.6%	1.1%
All VisMIn Prom.	9.2%	10.8%	11.7%	14.5%	9.2%	10.5%	-21.2%	-25.4%	-0.0%	2.5%
All Indigenous Prom.	8.5%	11.1%	9.3%	12.9%	8.2%	8.8%	-9.4%	-14.0%	3.2%	25.2%
All NVMIP Prom.	7.9%	8.8%	9.5%	12.4%	8.7%	10.0%	-16.3%	-28.8%	-8.6%	-11.6%
All employees Prom.	8.2%	10.5%	10.0%	12.9%	8.7%	10.0%	-17.1%	-18.6%	-5.5%	5.0%

Note: Given small numbers, gender breakdowns for Korean and Japanese not available for 2016-17 and 2017-18. Highlighting, 2025-24: Green increase of 10 percent or greater, Red decrease of 20 percent or less, 2025-17: Green, 10 percent or more increase, Red, 10 percent or more decrease

Indigenous peoples

Figure 6 indicates overall Indigenous representation, broken down by Indigenous groups, the 2024-25 [Employment Equity report](#) data, and the degree of over or under-representation of groups for all Indigenous employees and executives, compared to the 2021 census data.

The gaps are relatively small for all public servants, with Métis being over-represented and First Nations being under-represented. Representation has increased substantially from 2016-17 with some growth compared to 2023-24, with “Other” having increased the most. Representation is greater than workforce availability, based on 2021 census data, of 4.1 percent for all Indigenous employees and 3.9 percent for Indigenous executives.

Figure 6: Indigenous representation—All Employees and Executives

	2025	2024	2017	Gap Pop	PopCensus 21	Growth 2025-17	Change 2025-24	2025
Employees								
Métis	2.3%	2.3%	2.2%	0.6%	1.7%	49.7%	1.6%	6,235
First Nations	2.3%	2.2%	2.2%	-0.6%	2.9%	46.5%	2.5%	6,093
Inuit	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	-0.0%	0.2%	94.1%	3.9%	458
Other	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	67.7%	16.1%	1,952
All Indigenous	5.5%	5.3%	5.2%	0.5%	5.0%	51.5%	4.1%	14,738
Executives								
Métis	2.2%	2.3%	1.7%	0.5%	1.7%	94.5%	0.0%	177
First Nations	2.7%	2.5%	1.6%	-0.2%	2.9%	156.6%	8.1%	213
Inuit	0.1%	0.1%		-0.1%	0.2%		12.5%	9
Other	0.6%	0.6%		0.4%	0.2%		0.0%	46
All Indigenous	5.6%	5.5%	3.9%	0.6%	5.0%	116.0%	4.0%	445
Highlighting: Gap Population, Green, over represented, Red, under represented. Growth 2025-17, Growth 50 percent or more, 2024-23, Growth 5 percent or more								

Figure 7 highlights that Indigenous hiring rates are lower than visible minorities and NVMIP. However, the hiring of Indigenous peoples declined somewhat less sharply than for visible minorities in 2024-25 with the exception of NVMIP men compared to 2023-24. The decrease has been greatest for Métis women. Compared to 2016-17, hirings for First Nations have increased significantly, women more than men, with the totals for Métis also increasing (12 percent) but Inuit hirings decreasing (-17.3 percent).

Figure 7: Indigenous Hiring Rates

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Métis	5.7%	5.3%	7.9%	10.4%			-27.6%	-49.2%		
First Nations	6.4%	6.9%	8.2%	8.8%	5.0%	5.7%	-22.5%	-21.8%	28.0%	20.5%
Inuit	8.1%	8.6%	8.7%	7.9%			-6.9%	9.0%		
Other	3.4%	5.7%	4.6%	5.9%	15.9%	24.5%	-25.9%	-4.2%	-78.5%	-76.9%
All IP hires	3.9%	4.9%	3.5%	4.8%	3.3%	5.2%	-25.5%	-35.8%	-1.5%	-25.7%
All VisMin Hires	27.9%	26.6%	27.6%	26.3%	17.5%	18.1%	-30.2%	-37.1%	-8.6%	-24.3%
All non NVMIP hires	68.3%	68.5%	68.8%	68.9%	79.2%	76.7%	-17.0%	-35.8%	1.3%	-18.9%
All employees hires	7.3%	7.4%	10.0%	11.6%	8.0%	9.2%	-22.7%	-27.9%	-3.3%	-9.1%

Note: Given small numbers, gender breakdowns for Metis and Inuit not available for hirings in 2016-17. Change in total Métis from 2016-17, 12 percent, Inuit -17.3 percent. Highlighting, Red decrease -20 % or greater, Green increase of 20 percent or greater.

Figure 8 centres on overall separation rates, which have declined significantly for Indigenous men compared to 2023-24, with the exception of First Nations. Separation rates were lower for Indigenous men but comparable for Indigenous women to NVMIP in 2024-25. There is considerable variation between Indigenous men and women's separations, with Inuit and Métis men having lower separation rates compared to women, and the opposite for First Nations men and Inuit women.

Figure 8: Indigenous Separation Rates

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Métis	4.7%	5.4%	6.2%	5.6%	5.1%	5.4%	-25.1%	-3.4%	-8.9%	1.6%
First Nations	6.5%	7.9%	5.6%	7.4%	6.1%	5.4%	16.7%	5.6%	6.8%	45.8%
Inuit	7.5%	10.4%	11.4%	12.3%	9.2%	8.7%	-34.3%	-15.3%	-18.4%	19.7%
Other	4.2%	5.9%	5.9%	5.4%	10.2%	11.3%	-27.9%	7.8%	-58.4%	-48.0%
All IP Sep.	5.4%	6.6%	6.1%	6.6%	6.2%	6.2%	-10.8%	0.7%	-13.0%	7.9%
All VisMin Sep.	4.1%	4.0%	4.1%	3.8%	4.5%	5.9%	0.5%	4.7%	-10.1%	-32.5%
All NVMIP Sep.	6.2%	6.5%	6.2%	6.3%	6.5%	7.5%	0.9%	3.0%	-4.2%	-13.8%
All employees Sep.	5.7%	5.9%	5.7%	5.7%	6.2%	7.2%	-0.2%	2.7%	-8.3%	-18.1%

Note: Highlighting, Green increase of 15 percent or greater, Red decrease -15 percent or less.

Figure 9 examines the relative promotion rates by group and gender. Overall, Indigenous promotions are broadly comparable to NVMIP with some group and gender exceptions. Indigenous promotions have declined significantly less than visible minorities and NVMIP over the past year. Compared to 2016-17, promotion rates for Inuit men decreased significantly while Indigenous women's promotion rates increased dramatically.

Figure 9: Indigenous Promotion Rates

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Métis	8.3%	11.7%	9.4%	13.4%	8.5%	10.6%	-10.9%	-13.1%	-2.2%	10.5%
First Nations	8.6%	10.3%	8.6%	11.8%	7.9%	7.0%	0.9%	-12.3%	9.8%	47.9%
Inuit	6.9%	15.7%	12.1%	10.3%	9.2%	8.1%	-43.1%	52.5%	-25.2%	94.6%
Other	8.7%	10.8%	11.2%	15.7%	7.9%	10.0%	-22.9%	-31.4%	9.2%	7.8%
All Indigenous Prom.	8.5%	11.1%	9.3%	12.9%	8.2%	8.8%	-9.4%	-14.0%	3.2%	25.2%
All VisMIn Prom.	9.2%	10.8%	11.7%	14.5%	9.2%	10.5%	-21.2%	-25.4%	-0.0%	2.5%
All NVMIP Prom.	7.9%	10.4%	9.5%	12.4%	8.7%	10.0%	-16.3%	-16.5%	-8.6%	3.7%
All employees Prom.	8.2%	10.5%	10.0%	12.9%	0.0%	11.1%	-17.1%	-18.6%		-5.4%

Note: Highlighting, Green increase of 10 percent or greater, Red decrease -15% or less.

Concluding observations

These results need to be seen in the context of a public service that expanded by an average of 4.2 percent during 2017-23 and which subsequently stabilized given earlier and current restraint, with hirings down by 32 percent and promotions down by 18 percent in 2024-25.

Overall, the data shows that the government has made significant progress in increasing overall representation of visible minorities compared to non-visible minorities and non-Indigenous. Encouragingly, the net effect of the overall cuts in hirings and promotions does not appear to have resulted in any significant reversals of current diversity within the public service over the past year, although there are variations between the different equity groups.

Figure 10 contrasts hiring, separation, and promotion rates for visible minorities and Indigenous peoples with NVMIP, showing that overall hiring rates remain strong for both groups despite overall hiring cutbacks with fewer Indigenous separations. Similarly, the decline in promotions has affected Indigenous less than visible minorities and NVMIP. The 2017-25 comparison highlights the net shift in hirings and promotions between visible minorities and Indigenous and NVMIP.

Figure 10: Summary

	2025-24		2024-23		2016-17		% Δ 2025-24		% Δ 2025-17	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Hires										
All VisMIn	27.9%	26.6%	27.6%	26.3%	17.5%	18.1%	0.9%	1.2%	59.1%	46.9%
All Indigenous	3.9%	4.9%	3.5%	4.8%	3.3%	5.2%	9.8%	1.7%	17.3%	-6.1%
All non NVMIP	68.3%	68.5%	68.8%	68.9%	79.2%	76.7%	-0.9%	-0.6%	-13.8%	-10.7%
Separations										
All VisMIn	4.1%	4.0%	4.1%	3.8%	4.5%	5.9%	0.5%	4.7%	-10.1%	-32.5%
All Indigenous	5.4%	6.6%	6.1%	6.6%	6.2%	6.2%	-10.8%	0.7%	-13.0%	7.9%
All non NVMIP	6.2%	6.5%	6.2%	6.3%	6.5%	7.5%	0.9%	3.0%	-4.2%	-13.8%
Promotions										
All VisMIn	9.2%	10.8%	11.7%	14.5%	9.2%	10.5%	-21.2%	-25.4%	-0.0%	2.5%
All Indigenous	8.5%	11.1%	9.3%	12.9%	8.2%	8.8%	-9.4%	-14.0%	3.2%	25.2%
All non NVMIP	7.4%	9.5%	9.5%	12.4%	8.7%	10.0%	-21.6%	-23.1%	-14.4%	-4.6%

Note: Highlighting plus or minus 10 percent

Visible minorities continue to have lower separation rates compared to NVMIP, all reflecting in part the overall younger age of visible minorities, with 31 percent under 35 years old, compared to Indigenous at 23 percent and all public servants at 25 percent.

However, the results are more mixed for Indigenous peoples. The decline in hiring rates was less than visible minorities but greater for NVMIP men. Separation rates declined significantly with the exception of First Nations. Promotion rates declined less than visible minorities and NVMIP and promotions of Inuit women increased significantly.

Figure 11 looks at the changes in representation for all four equity groups compared to the previous year for the 10 largest organizations (close to two-thirds of public servants). While a Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives [analysis](#) highlighted the risks of deeper cuts to the equity groups but to date it appears that apart from women, overall representation has increased for most equity groups in most of largest organization with the exceptions of visible minorities in IRCC, Indigenous at ESDC, Correctional Services and RCMP and Persons with disabilities at ESDC.

Figure 11: Change in Representation 2024-25 from 2023-24 for the 10 largest organizations

Department or agency	2024-25	Change from 2023-24				
	Employees	All	Women	Indigenous	PwD	VisMin
Employment & Social Development	38,334	0.5%	0.3%	-5.1%	-3.7%	2.7%
National Defence	28,241	1.9%	2.0%	9.4%	27.3%	11.0%
Correctional Service	18,660	0.3%	0.8%	-0.8%	4.8%	7.6%
Public Services and Procurement	18,381	1.0%	1.2%	5.4%	17.0%	7.3%
Canada Border Services Agency	16,235	1.8%	1.0%	17.2%	31.0%	16.8%
Fisheries & Oceans	13,924	-1.4%	-1.6%	39.6%	69.7%	24.8%
Immigration, Refugees & Citizenship	10,974	-9.6%	-10.3%	-5.9%	-4.7%	-10.6%
RCMP	10,822	9.5%	8.2%	6.0%	22.4%	19.0%
Health	9,173	-4.4%	-4.9%	-3.8%	0.4%	-2.7%
Shared Services	8,671	-3.3%	-7.2%	0.6%	3.4%	-1.1%

Source: Table 1: Distribution of public service of Canada employees by designated group according to department or agency, 2024-25 and 2023-24 EE reports. Highlighting: Red, lower than all employees, Green, greater than all employees by department

The fears of unions and advocates are not substantiated by 2024-25 data which suggest that the public service to date has been taking into account equity considerations. It remains to be seen, however, whether the current round of cuts maintains an equity focus or not.

The rich public service desegregated data on visible minorities and Indigenous peoples—representation, hirings, separations and promotions—will continue to provide the needed data to assess any impacts, both internally and in public reporting.

Methodology

Data was provided by the Treasury Board Secretariat for visible minorities and Indigenous peoples for fiscal years 2016-17 to 2023-24, by occupational group and gender. Analysis highlights hiring, separation, and promotion rates (percentage of hires, separations, promotions compared to the overall visible minority or Indigenous group population). The percentage of hirings was the percentage of total hires. Separation and promotion rates were based upon the number of men and women compared to the total number of men and women public servants in the specific group. (e.g., 2025 data was compared to 2017 data to indicate changes over this period. Change is by percentage change (i.e., 10 percent compared to 5 percent: $(10-5)/5=100\%$).

Andrew Griffith is the author of *[“Because it’s 2015...” Implementing Diversity and Inclusion](#)*, *[Multiculturalism in Canada: Evidence and Anecdote](#)* and *[Policy Arrogance or Innocent Bias: Resetting Citizenship and Multiculturalism](#)* and is a regular media commentator and blogger ([Multiculturalism Meanderings](#)). He is the former Director General for Citizenship and Multiculturalism and has worked for a variety of government departments in Canada and abroad and is a fellow of the Canadian Global Affairs Institute and Environics Institute.